	Case 3:07-cv-05981-SC	Document 18	Filed 12/10/2007	Page 1 of 5				
1	GREGORY D. HULL (57367)							
2	Email: greg.hull@weil.com JOSEPH R. WETZEL (238008)							
3	Email: joseph.wetzel@weil.com WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP							
4	201 Redwood Shores Parkway Redwood Shores, California 94065-1175							
5	Telephone: (650) 802-3000 Facsimile: (650) 802-3100							
6	,							
7	STEVEN A. REISS Email: steven.reiss@weil.com							
8	DAVID L. YOHAI Email: david.yohai@weil.com							
10	WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP 767 Fifth Avenue							
11	New York, New York 10153-0119 Telephone: (212) 310-8000							
12	Facsimile: (212) 310-8007							
13	JEFFREY L. KESSLER Email: jkessler@dl.com							
14	A. PAUL VICTOR Email: pvictor@dl.com							
15	Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP 1301 Avenue of the Americas							
16	New York, NY 10019 Telephone: (212) 259-8000							
17	Facsimile: (212) 259-7013							
18 19	Attorneys for Defendant PANASONIC CORPORATION OF NORTH AMERICA							
20	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
21	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA							
22	NATHAN MUCHNICK, IN and all others similarly situa		f Case No. CV 07	5981-MEJ				
23	•							
24	Plaintif	ff,	TIME FOR DE	N RE EXTENSION OF EFENDANT TO				
25			RESPOND TO	VE, OR OTHERWISE PLAINTIFF'S				
26	v.		COMPLAINT					
2728	CHUNGHWA PICTURE TO TATUNG COMPANY OF A	· ·						
	STIPULATION RE EXTENSION NY1:\1529402\03\WS3#03!.DOC\62130.0354	N OF TIME		Case No. CV 07 5981- MEJ				

1	LG ELECTRONICS INC; LG PHILIPS					
2	DISPLAY USA, INC.; MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.;					
3	PANASONIC CORPORATION OF NORTH					
4	AMERICA; KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.; PHILIPS ELECTRONICS					
5	NORTH AMERICA CORPORATION; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.;					
6	SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.;					
	SAMSUNG SDI CO., LTD. f/k/a SAMSUNG DISPLAY DEVICE CO.; TOSHIBA					
7	CORPORATION TOSHIBA AMERICA					
8	ELECTRONICS COMPONENTS INC.; TOSHIBA AMERICA INFORMATION					
9	SYSTEMS INC.;					
10	MT PICTURE DISPLAY COMPANY; MT PICTURE DISPLAY CORPORATION OF					
11	AMERICA (New York); MT PICTURE DISPLAY CORPORATION OF AMERICA					
12	(Ohio); and LP DISPLAYS,					
13	Defendants.					
14	WHEREAS Plaintiff Nathan Muchnick, Inc. ("Plaintiff") filed a complaint in the					
15						
16	above-captioned case on or about November 27, 2007;					
17	WHEREAS Plaintiff alleges antitrust violations by manufacturers, distributors,					
18	and sellers of Cathode-Ray Tubes and products containing Cathode-Ray Tubes (collectively,					
19	"CRT products");					
20	WHEREAS six complaints have been filed to date in federal district courts					
21	throughout the United States by plaintiffs purporting to bring class actions on behalf of direct and					
22	indirect purchasers alleging antitrust violations by manufacturers, distributors, and sellers of CRT					
23	products (collectively, "the CRT Cases");					
24						
25	WHEREAS, a motion is pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict					
26	Litigation to transfer the CRT cases to this jurisdiction for coordinated and consolidated pretrial					
27	proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. A response to the motion has been filed, and the					
28	parties anticipate that additional responses will be filed by plaintiffs and various defendants;					
	STIPULATION RE EXTENSION OF TIME Case No. CV 07 5981 - ME					

2

NY1:\1529402\03\WS3#03!.DOC\62130.0354

WHEREAS Plaintiff anticipates the possibility of Consolidated Amended Complaints in the CRT Cases;

WHEREAS Plaintiff and Defendant Panasonic Corporation of North America

("PNA") have agreed that an orderly schedule for any response to the pleadings in the CRT Cases

would be more efficient for the parties and for the Court;

WHEREAS Plaintiff agrees that the deadline for PNA to answer, move, or otherwise respond to the Complaint shall be extended until the earliest of the following dates: (1) forty-five days after the filing of a Consolidated Amended Complaint in the CRT Cases; or (2) forty-five days after Plaintiff provides written notice to PNA that Plaintiff does not intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint, provided however, that in the event that PNA should agree to an earlier response date in any CRT case, PNA will respond to the Complaint in the above-captioned action on that earlier date;

WHEREAS Plaintiff further agrees that this extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for Plaintiff, to all named defendants who notify Plaintiff in writing of their intention to join this Stipulation;

WHEREAS this Stipulation does not constitute a waiver by PNA of any defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of personal jurisdiction, subject matter jurisdiction, improper venue, sufficiency of process or service of process;

WHEREAS, with respect to any named defendant joining the stipulation, this
Stipulation does not constitute a waiver of any defense, including but not limited to the defenses
of lack of personal jurisdiction, subject matter jurisdiction, improper venue, sufficiency of process
or service of process.

PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 6-1(a), PLAINTIFF AND DEFENDANT PNA,
BY AND THROUGH THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF RECORD, HEREBY STIPULATE

1. The deadline for PNA to answer, move, or otherwise respond to the Complaint shall be extended until the earliest of the following dates: (1) forty-five days after the filing of a Consolidated Amended Complaint in the CRT Cases; or (2) forty-five days after Plaintiff provides written notice to PNA that Plaintiff does not intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint, provided however, that in the event that PNA should agree to an earlier response date in any CRT case, PNA will respond to the Complaint in the above-captioned action on that earlier date.

- 2. This extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for Plaintiff, to all named defendants who notify Plaintiff in writing of their intention to join this Stipulation;
- 3. This Stipulation does not constitute a waiver by PNA, or any other named defendant joining the Stipulation of any defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of personal jurisdiction, subject matter jurisdiction, improper venue, sufficiency of process or service of process.

By his signature below, counsel for Panasonic Corporation attests under penalty of perjury that counsel for Nathan Muchnick, Inc. concurs in the filing of this Stipulation.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

DATED: December 10, 2007

By: s/Ruthanne Gordon

H. Laddie Montague, Jr.

Ruthanne Gordon

Candice Enders

BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C.

1622 Locust Street

Philadelphia PA 19103 Telephone: (215) 875-3000 Facsimile: (215) 875-4604

[Case 3:07-cv-05981-SC	Document 18	Filed 12/10/2007	Page 5 of 5			
1				n (State Bar No. 063607)			
2			Fric B. Fastiff (State	rate Bar No. 130064) e Bar No. 182260)			
3			LIEFF, CABRASEI BERNSTEIN, LLP	R, HEIMANN &			
4			275 Battery Street, 3				
5			San Francisco, CA Telephone: (415) 93				
6			Facsimile: (415) 95	6-1008			
7		Attorneys for individual and Representative Plaintiff Nathan Muchnick, Inc.					
8		By: s/Gregory D. Hull					
9			Gregory D. Hull (573 Joseph R. Wetzel (23				
10			WEIL, GOTSHAL &				
11			201 Redwood Shores Redwood Shores, Cal	•			
12			Telephone: (650) 802	2-3000			
13			Facsimile: (650) 802-	-3100			
14			Steven A. Reiss David L. Yohai				
15			WEIL, GOTSHAL &	MANGES LLP			
16			767 Fifth Avenue New York, New Yorl	k 10153-0119			
			Telephone: (212) 310	0-8000			
17			Facsimile: (212) 310	-8007			
18			Jeffrey L. Kessler A. Paul Victor				
19			Dewey & LeBoeuf L	LP			
20			1301 Avenue of the A				
21			New York, NY 10019 Telephone: (212) 259				
22			Facsimile: (212) 259-	-7013			
23			•	ant Panasonic Corporation			
24			of North America				
25							
26							
27							
28							
20							